UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,493	06/14/2001	Pankaj K. Jha	0325.00482	7913

21363 7590 06/14/2006

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.
24840 HARPER SUITE 100
ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080

EXAMINER	
PATEL, HARESH N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/881,493	JHA, PANKAJ K.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1,10 and 20* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 March 2006* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/2/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments pages 10-36, dated 3/16/2006, with respect to the **amended** claims 1-20 with **additional limitations**, dated 3/16/2006, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Applicant states, "In the Response to Arguments section of the current Office Action on pages 3-34 (and in previous Office Actions), **multiple quotes** are improperly credited to the Applicant. In contrast, no such quotes exist in the **amendments**".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's statements.

For clarification, all the responses in the previous office action dated 11/16/2005 have **properly addressed the applicant's concerns (arguments, statements)** dated 6/20/2005 and 11/24/2004 (please see office action dated 11/16/2005).

In fact, the statements, "In the Response to Arguments section of the current Office Action on pages 3-34 (and in previous Office Actions), multiple quotes are improperly credited to the Applicant. In contrast, no such quotes exist in the amendments", **are misleading,** because the applicant did not identify which "multiple quotes" in the office action pages 3-34 (and in previous Office Actions) of the several quotes (**of the at least 25 responses**) that exist within the thirty-two pages of the office action.

Further, applicant's statement, "no such quotes exist in the **amendments**", has **nothing to do** with the responses in the previous office action, as no one including the examiner (in the prosecution history of this case) **ever mentioned** about **quotes existing** in the **amendments**. Also, the applicant did not identify which are the "amendments" in the office action pages 3-34 (and in previous Office Actions) of the several amendments (**of the at least 25 responses**) that exist within the thirty-two pages of the previous office action.

Hence, the examiner maintains that the response in the Arguments section of the previous Office Action dated 11/16/2005 **was proper** and the arts used for the rejection in the previous office action properly taught / disclosed the claimed limitations (please see the office action dated 11/16/2005), and the additional limitations exist in the claims (see claims 10 and 1), which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action), necessitated by the applicant's amendment.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the claimed invention to which the **amended** claims are directed.

The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter. In fact, the present is too broad compared to what is claimed.

The following title is suggested: "An assembly for delineating a receive frame from one network to another network based on processing logic".

Drawings

5. New corrected drawings are required in this application because the figures 1-6, dated 6/14/2001, do not contain the claimed invention of the **amended claims**, "a database **circuit** to store a plurality of pointer values for each of a plurality of first parameters defined by a network protocol, incoming packet received by the assembly in accordance with said corresponding pointer value to produce a second parameter and present an **outgoing packet** containing said second parameter from the assembly, a **particular** one of the first parameters in an incoming packet, **second incoming** packet, **second outgoing** packet to present a **second transmit frame**, etc". Also, applicant is requested to replace label "conventional" with --Prior Art-- of figure 1. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1, 10 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 mentions, "plurality pointer values", which should be --plurality of pointer values--.

Claims 1 and 10 mention, "said corresponding pointer value", which should be --said one of said pointer values--.

Claim 20 mentions, "configured process a select one of said first parameters", which should be -- configured process to select one of said first parameters --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. **Amended** claims 1-6, 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogawa et al. 5,936,966 (Hereinafter Ogawa).

9. As per claims 1 and 10, Ogawa teaches an assembly (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 – 59, col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 22) comprising:

a database circuit (e.g., col., 6, lines 38 – 67) configured to store a plurality pointer values (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14) for a plurality of first parameters (e.g., col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 22) defined by of a network protocol (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 – 15) wherein,

one (Note: "each one" means "each of one", hence "one only") of said first parameters is associated with a corresponding **one** of said pointer values (e.g., col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 22);

and a processing circuit (e.g., col., 13, lines 26 –55) configured to (i) process a particular **one** of said parameters (e.g., col., 11, lines 58 – 67, col., 13, lines 15 – 21) in an incoming packet received by the assembly (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 – 59) in accordance with said corresponding pointer value (e.g., col., 13, lines 20 –55) to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24), and (ii) configured to present an outgoing packet (e.g., col., 8, lines 50 – 63) from said (e.g.,) containing the second parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24),

a first circuit (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14) configured to delineate a receive frame received (e.g., col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 22) from a first network having a first network protocol to produce incoming packet (e.g., col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 22);

a second circuit configured to (i) store plurality of pointer values for a plurality (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14) of first parameters (col., 10, lines 3 – 48) defined by said first network protocol (e.g., col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 22) wherein, **one** (Note: "each one" means "each of one", hence "one only") of said first parameters is associated with a corresponding **one** of said pointer values (e.g., col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 22); (ii) process a particular **one** of said parameters (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24) in said incoming packet in accordance with said corresponding pointer value (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14) to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24) and (ii) present an outgoing packet (e.g., col., 8, lines 50 – 63) containing said second parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24),

a third circuit (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14) configured to frame the outgoing packet (e.g., col., 8, lines 50 – 63) to present a transmit frame to a second network (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14).

10. As per claim 2, Ogawa teaches the following:

the database circuit is further configured to store a plurality of offset values and a plurality of length values for said first parameters (e.g., col., 11, lines 58 – 67, col., 13, lines 15 – 21), **one** of the first parameters is further associated with both a corresponding **one** of said offset values and a corresponding **one** of said length values and said processing circuit (e.g., col., 4, lines 3 – 12, col., 4, lines 45 – 54) is further configured to partition said incoming packet (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14) in accordance with **at least one of** said offset values and at least one of said length values (e.g., col., 11, lines 58 – 67, col., 13, lines 15 – 21) to extract said particular first parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 27 - 65).

11. As per claim 3, Ogawa teaches the following:

an interface through which said offset values, said length values and said pointer values are downloaded for storage in said database circuit (e.g., col., 11, lines 58 – 67, col., 13, lines 15 – 21).

12. As per claim 4, Ogawa teaches the following:

a parsing circuit configured to partition said incoming packet (e.g., col., 4, lines 3 – 12, col., 4, lines 45 – 54)

a plurality of peripheral blocks (e.g., col., 11, lines 58 – 67, col., 13, lines 15 – 21) coupled to said parsing circuit (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14) identified by the pointer values and configured to perform a plurality of processes involving said first parameters and an assembling circuit coupled to said peripheral blocks (e.g., col., 11, lines 58 – 67, col., 13, lines 15 – 21) and configured to generate said outgoing packet (e.g., col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14).

13. As per claim 5, Ogawa teaches the following:

database circuit is further configured to store both a second offset value (e.g., col., 3, lines 1 – 23), and a second length value for said second parameter as defined by a second network protocol (e.g., col., 4, lines 16 – 61).

14. As per claim 6, Ogawa teaches the following:

an interface connectable to a peripheral block external to said assembly (e.g., col., 3, lines 41 - 57).

15. As per claim 8, Ogawa teaches the following:

said peripheral blocks are configured to simultaneously processes a plurality of said first parameters (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 15).

16. As per claim 9, Ogawa teaches the following:

processing circuit is implemented as only hardware (e.g., col., 25, lines 8 – 38).

17. As per claim 11, Ogawa teaches the following:

wherein said second circuit is further configured to store a plurality of offset values and a plurality of length values (e.g., col., 9, lines 1 – 23) **for** said first parameters and **one** of said first parameters is further associated with both a corresponding one of said offset values an a corresponding one of said length values (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 –24, col., 9, lines 41 - 57) and partition said incoming packet (e.g., col., 6, lines 16 – 61) in accordance with said offset values and said length values (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 –24, col., 9, lines 41 - 57) to extract said first parameters from said incoming packet (e.g., col., 3, lines 7 – 16).

18. As per claim 12, Ogawa teaches the following:

wherein said first circuit is further configured to provided a plurality of frame delineation methods (e.g, col., 8, lines 41 - 57, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24) for a plurality of network protocols (e.g., col., 4, lines 11-24, col., 6, lines 15 - 22, lines 44 - 54).

19. As per claim 13, Ogawa teaches the following:

further comprising an interface (e.g, col., 5, lines 41 – 57, col., 8, line 58 - col., 9, line 24) configured to permit a selection among said frame delineation methods (e.g, col., 4, lines 16 - 34, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24).

20. As per claim 14, Ogawa teaches the following:

said third circuit (e.g., col., 7, lines 11 -24, col., 2, lines 41 - 57, col., 8, line 58 - col., 9, line 24) is further configured to provided a plurality of framing methods (e.g., col., 4, lines 4 - 57, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24, col., 8, lines 54 -65) for a plurality of network protocols (e.g., col., 7, lines 11 -24, col., 6, lines 15 - 22, lines 44 - 54).

21. As per claim 15, Ogawa teaches the following:

further comprising an interface (e.g., col., 3, lines 41 - 57, figures 11 and 15, col., 8, line 58 - col., 9, line 24) configured to permit a selection among said framing methods (e.g., col., 5, lines 16 – 34, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24, col., 8, lines 54 - 65).

22. As per claim 16, Ogawa teaches the following:

said third circuit (e.g., col., 6, lines 11 - 24, col., 9, lines 41 - 57, figures 11 and 15, col., 8, line 58 - col., 9, line 24) is further configured to delineate a second receive frame (e.g., col., 3, line 50 - col., 4, line 14) from said second network (e.g., col., 2, lines 11 - 24, col., 3, lines 41 - 57, col., 6, lines 15 -22, lines 44 - 54) to produce a second incoming packet (e.g., col., 9, lines 28 - 41).

23. As per claim 17, Ogawa teaches the following:

said first circuit is further configured to frame (e.g., col., 5, lines 41 -57, col., 3, lines 51 - 67, col., 4, lines 50 - col., 5, line 14, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24) a second outgoing packet (e.g., col., 3, lines 11 - 24, col., 10 , lines 11 - 28) derived from said second incmong packet to present a second transmit frame (e.g., col., 6, lines 41 -57, col., 3, lines 51 - 67, col., 4, lines 50 - col., 5, line 14, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24) to said first network.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa in view of "Official Notice".

26. As per claim 7, Ogawa teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Ogawa does not specifically mention about the peripheral blocks being particular circuits.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing the peripheral blocks are at least two circuits selected from a group of circuits consisting of a content addressable memory circuit, a parity circuit, a first-in-first-out circuit, time to live circuit, content comparison counter circuit, a value swapping circuit, a stuffing de-stuffing circuit, a cyclic redundancy checksum length construction generator circuit, synchronization circuit, a frame relay lookup circuit, a data link header error control connection identifier circuit, a protocol identification analysis circuit, a point-to-point protocol verification circuit, parameter discard circuit, and a buffer circuit is well known and expected in the art. For example, Yusa et. al., 5,633,806 discloses these limitations, col., 3, lines 2 – 58. Wilford et. al. 6,687,247 discloses these limitations, col., 5, lines 12 – 43. Azadet et al. 2001/0034729 discloses these limitations, col., 3, lines 2 – 38. Ayyagari et al. 6,894,991 discloses these limitations, col., 4, lines 8 – 42.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the concept of making the processing non-programmable with the teaching's of Ogawa in order to facilitate the usage of the above-mentioned circuits because the concept of usage of the above mentioned well-known circuits would support handling of the packet related information. The usage of the circuits would help processing information that is related to the packet.

27. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa in view of Gabrick et al., 2002/0161802 (Hereinafter Gabrick).

28. As per claim 18, Ogawa teaches the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10. Ogawa also discloses a plurality of framing circuits (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 – 66).

Ogawa does not specifically mention about usage of a corresponding one of the network protocols.

Gabrick discloses a concept of using a corresponding one of the network protocols (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 – 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogawa with the teachings of Gabrick in order to facilitate usage of a corresponding one of the network protocols because the corresponding network protocol would support replicating and transferring information between two entities. The replication and transferring information would support providing information to the network device.

29. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa in view of Wilford et al. 6,687,247 (Hereinafter Wilford) and Gabrick.

30. As per claim 19, Ogawa teach the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10.

However, Ogawa does not specifically mention about a plurality of de-framing circuits.

Wilford discloses a plurality of de-framing circuits (e.g., use of several circuits for deframing, col., 2, lines 59 – col., 3, line 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogawa with the teachings of Wilford in order to facilitate usage of a plurality of de-framing circuits means because the de-framing circuits would enhance the handling the information associated with the packet, and the packet related information would help enhance the software to process information for the assembly.

Ogawa and Wilford do not specifically mention about usage of a corresponding one of the network protocols.

Gabrick discloses a concept of using a corresponding one of the network protocols (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 – 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogawa and Wilford with the teachings of Gabrick in order to facilitate usage of a corresponding one of the network protocols because the corresponding network protocol would support replicating and transferring information between two entities. The replication and transferring information would support providing information to the network device.

31. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa in view of Yanagihara et al. 5,899,578 (Hereinafter Yanagihara).

32. As per claim 20, Ogawa teach the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10.

However, Ogawa does not specifically mention about a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit and configured process a select of the first parameters.

Yanagihara discloses a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit (e.g., two connected circuits that handle video data and audio data for processing, figure 10A, col., 1, lines 51 - 66) and configured process a select of the first parameters (e.g., processing of video data, audio data, broadcast programs etc., figure 10A, col., 1, lines 51 - 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogawa with the teachings of Yanagihara in order to facilitate usage of a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit and configured process a select one of the first parameters because the another circuit would enhance the handling the information associated with the packet, and the packet related information would help enhance the software to process information for the assembly. The connection between two circuits would provide communication between two devices.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

June 08, 2006